6/4/70

Howard (Dick),

There is much I'll not address in your two of 6/1 because it isn't essential and because I'm too tired.

Thanks for valuable Hoover clips. You should make it a practise to identify all clips by source and date before clipping, so as not to forget.

Rankin is not a big corporation lawyer but is Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, i.e., its chief legal office. Redlich is his assistant and has been since Lindsay became mayor. Rankin is supposed to be a liberal Republican. His law practise was nothing, so he got this political payoff. If you have a clip on that I'd like it for my Rankin file and possible future quotation.

Nichols picture. Let this wait until you and here, with your slides and A corres on it (important in suit). I have still had no response, so even the date of the letter to you assumes significance.

Missing fragment. Ideally, we should have a picture of this from every projection. I suggested what I regard as minimum, a view of the longest side taken at right-angles to the view you have. We may assume its source, and the assumption may be correct, but we should not assume and there may be other possibilities. This is an important area in proof and in rebutting arguments we cannot have certain things because they must preserve and protect, etc.

Hair. I take no offense and meant none. It was both funny and had a certain validity, in ways not worth time now. However, in working within the system, as you do, the question is a simple one: can it be done with iconoclast appearance? In hot weather, when I go to DC, inc. Archives, I wear sandals, no socks, shorts and sport shirt, no more. But when I go to DJ, I wear suit. I use scantier attire for comfort and as preventive for heat rash, but not inflexibly. Do not take this as a suggestion you cut your hair. You do what is honest for you, what you want. Here I make but a single point: it can be an inhibition, and if it is, you then may have to evaluate at some point which is more important for you. When we are in court and, as I hope, you are with me, you have it as long as you please.

There are two things you can do for both of us when you are here. I finished what you started and thought I'd sent you and Dick copies. However, it was done in haste and is chronological. I think the same thing should not be done by subject and agency. To this end, Bud having my only complete duplicate file, I am making two more: a dupe for working and one for court. I'm almost through 1969 on this, Archives only. They there will have to be DJ and SS and Burke Marshall. The other things you can do now and we should both have use for it. Take the autopsy proctocol and isolate every fact, statement, description, measurement, opinion, interpretation, etc., and see if it can be found recorded in the body chart and head sketch (where I think I recall inaccuracy). If this is not possible, then I'll have still another proof of the existence of notes since disappeared but not burned by Humes 11/24/63. My chief interest is in court. I once did this with the changes but cannot now find it.

Lifton-pictures. When I recall the passion withi which he described to me the absolute proof of the assassination committed from papier-mache trees and the secret tunnelling of Dealey Plaza by Brown and Root -and having seen a fairly clear Moorman - I think your feet will survive the emotion of his picture. I cannot afford the Nix and Muchmore, but someone else wants them, a men in position to do what you, Gary, Dick and I can't. I've mentioned this to Gary and we'll see if he

get them for the other fellow. Did he give you source? Or say which is clearer, 8 o5 16?

Helleck hearing: we have transcript of a.m. session, Forman and Wecht. I have already condensed. Aside from his opinions (Forman is unusable), there is nothing not in PM III, for I gave him what he'd missed. His opinions, however, are excellent. Bud has complete a.m. transcript. The p.m. can be examined in the clerk's office, and when you are here and I go to DC, you can do that. There is nothing in it that I recall save the utter futility of the government's effort.

There was no 17 mph wind. There were occasional gust to 10 mph, as I recall, and, unless terrain changed, from the north. Without claiming it happened, I tell you again we are without absolute proof there was not a later shot. And the fact is that what Weitzman found, in theory, couldn't have gotten there, yet he found it so fast, there was no chance of a child, etc. And what he saw thrown was not there but into bushes, as I remember. But that could have been another part. ?? I am persuaded the man in the pictures Chapman gave me and JG later used is a federal or local dick and he was not picking up dogdroppings. There remains no official record of any of this. It therefore is something not congenial to the FBI contrivings.

When you can make it without cost, please send me a copy of the covering letter with the Nichols picture only. The rest can wait. But I may yet get another answer from them and I should be prepared.

Sincerely,

As of newo any time will do. I still hope to get to Wilmington and pretty soon I'll be occupied with my helicopter suit.